

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated September 25, 2007, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, because the Examiner stated the claims as a whole do not provide for a practical application, as evidenced by a lack of physical transformation or useful, tangible, and concrete result.

In response, each of independent claims 1, 14 and 19, in addition to bringing the allowable subject matter of claims 2-3, 15 and 20 respectively therein, have been amended to refer to the body as a body to be produced, and the procedures respectively described in those claims have been stated to produce a last iteration, with the electromagnetic compatibility of the body with respect to its environment then being assessed and, if the electromagnetic compatibility is satisfactory, the body is produced according to the values in the last iteration. This is clearly a useful, tangible and concrete result, and therefore all claims are submitted to be in full compliance with all provisions of 35 U.S.C. §101.

Support for the aforementioned amendments to the independent claims is present in the specification as originally filed in the paragraphs beginning at lines 7 and 14 respectively, at page 5 of the present specification. From those passages, as well as numerous other passages in the present specification, it is clear that the goal of the invention is to, before producing a product, simulate the electromagnetic field of the body in question for the purpose of assessing its electromagnetic compatibility with the environment in which it will be used, so as to avoid producing a body that is electromagnetically incompatible with the environment, thereby avoiding time and money for producing a body that cannot be used.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Although claim 13 has been cancelled, the subject matter thereof is embodied in independent claim 1 and the language of claim 1 refers to determining the electromagnetic compatibility of the body with regard to an environment of the body. The present specification at page 1 cites DIN Standard VDE 0870 as defining electromagnetic compatibility standards, and these standards are well to those of ordinary skill in the relevant technology, as are numerous techniques for determining whether those standards are satisfied. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that independent claim 1, now embodying the subject matter of claim 13 therein, is in full compliance with all provisions of §112, first paragraph.

Claim 12 also has been amended to refer to the low frequencies as being low frequencies that can be expected in the environment in which the body is to be used. Applicant acknowledges that the present specification does not provide a specific numerical value, or numerical value range, for such low frequencies, however, it is common sense that, since the techniques disclosed in the present application are for the purpose of providing a body that is electromagnetically compatible with the environment in which it will be used, the low frequencies in question must then also be low frequencies expected in that environment. Since the precise numerical value of such low frequencies will be known only when the environment itself is identified, it is sufficient under §112, second paragraph to define the low frequencies in claim 12 in this manner. As stated in MPEP §2173.02, it is only necessary that the claims define the patentable subject matter with a *reasonable* degree of particularity and distinctness, and some latitude in the manner of expression and aptness of terms should be permitted, even though the claim language is not as precise as the

Examiner might desire. Additionally, as stated in MPEP §2173.05(a), Section II, if the claims, read in light of the specification, reasonably apprise those skilled in the art both of the utilization and scope of the invention, *and if the language is as precise as the subject matter permits*, §112, second paragraph demands no more.

Claim 12 is therefore submitted to be in full compliance with all provisions of §112, second paragraph.

As to the rejections based on the prior art, Applicant submits those rejections are overcome by the aforementioned inclusion of the subject matter in each of the independent claims that the Examiner has stated to be allowable over the art.

Typographical errors in the specification and in claim 7 also have been corrected.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Submitted by,

 (Reg. 28,982)

---

SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**  
Patent Department  
6600 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312/258-5790  
Attorneys for Applicant.

CH15386736.1